

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:**

Claims 1-17 have been pending.

Claims 1-17 are rejected.

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended, claims 13 and 17 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice and claims 18 and 19 are added, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

**OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION AND CLAIMS:**

The Office Action page 2, items 4 and 6 objects to the specification, including the claims, because it allegedly consists of faulty English, and the Examiner requests a substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b).

Regarding the objection to the specification and the substitute specification requirements, 37 CFR 1.125(a) provides that a substitute specification might be required "[i]f the number or nature of the amendments or the legibility of the application papers renders it difficult to consider the application ...." However, upon a review of the specification, and in view of the Examiner not specifying why the specification has faulty English, it is respectfully asserted that the specification uses proper idiomatic English sentences and the specification is not difficult to consider.

Further, regarding the missing alphanumeric characters, it is understood that the Office copy of the application specification, including the claims, has become corrupted by having the missing alphanumeric characters (based upon the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) image file wrapper). For the convenience of the Office and the Examiner for entry into the Office records, another complete copy of the specification, including the claims, as originally filed on the application filing date of January 30, 2004 is submitted and attached hereto. It is submitted that the originally filed specification, including the claims, did not contain any missing alphanumeric characters.

Therefore, a substitute specification requirement is not appropriate, and withdrawal of the objection in view of the remarks and the submission of the originally filed application including the claims, is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

TITLE:

The title of the invention, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments, is replaced. Withdrawal of the objection to the title is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTION:

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action alleges the claims do not use words known to those of ordinary skill in the art. For example, the term "operation system." However, it is readily apparent that, according to the language of the claims "...a computer, ~~that constitutes~~ operating as a server in as an operation system and handling as its ~~the operation system~~ operating character code a plurality of different character codes, to execute...", the claimed phrase "operation system" comprises a computer.

The Examiner, at item 9, lines 7-9, asserts that the claim recitation of "operation system" was a mistranslation of an "operating system." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. It is clear from, for example, Fig. 1, that one embodiment of an operation system comprises a computer operating as a server, the server further comprising a start-up processing unit, a kana-to-kanji conversion unit, a font image generating unit, and an editing/outputting unit, and, thus, it is clear the claimed "operation system" is a computer and is not a mistranslation of an "operating system."

The Office Action further alleges that the terms "intermediate code" and "operation character code" are not known to those of ordinary skill in the art or been specifically redefined to convey any meaning. Applicants respectfully disagree. Application specification, page 6, lines 9-22 expressly states:

According to the invention, **an intermediate code of kanji characters is a large-scale code containing a plurality of operating character codes** and, in a kana-to-kanji conversion step, a large-scale code corresponding to kana-reading information of an input character string is obtained by referring to a kana-to-kanji conversion table in which the large-scale code is registered and, furthermore, **an operating character code corresponding to the large-scale code of the kanji character string is obtained by referring to a code conversion table in**

**which a plurality of operating character codes are registered corresponding to the large-scale code.**

Therefore, the claims clearly recite features of the invention as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, according to 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as applicant's invention, and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 101 REJECTION:**

Claims 1-10, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-10, 12, 14 and 16 are amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTION:**

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibuya, U.S. Patent No. 5,999,951, hereinafter referred to as "Shibuya."

The rejected independent claims are 1, 11, 12 and 14-16.

Shibuya discusses "[i]n the server 1, when all the steps of Romaji-to-kana conversion are completed and it is determined that kana-to-kanji conversion can be executed to the string (step S27), kana-to-kanji conversion is executed thereto based on the kana data" (Shibuya, column 8, lines 29-33). In other words, Shibuya discusses sending Roman characters, i.e. the English alphabet characters, to a server where a Romaji-to-kana conversion occurs before a kana-to-kanji conversion can occur. Shibuya further discusses, at column 4, lines 47-63:

The client 2 as a representative of one or a plurality of **clients** has **mainly an application 20 for displaying** a kana and converted character string and **an user interface user I/F 21**. This application 20 for displaying a kana and converted character string is a program for displaying a character string inputted using the user I/F 21

Shibuya further discusses, at column 8, line 62, to column 9, line 5:

When the first candidate of kanji character string has been displayed and if the conversion key 28a is operated once again in the side of client 2 (step S5), the instruction for conversion is again issued to the server 1 (step S6). When this instruction for conversion is accepted by the server 1 (step S30), it is determined by the server 1 that the instruction is for changing to some other candidates to be displayed for the same input character string, so

that the second candidate of kanji character string currently stored in the buffer 13B for kana and converted character strings is read out to be returned to the originator (step S31).

In other words, Shibuya requires "an application" on the client terminal to input character string to be converted. Shibuya further requires the client to repeatedly submit a conversion command to the server until the correct candidate is sent from the server to the client application. Therefore, Shibuya only discusses a kana-to-kanji conversion method of sending input kana information to a server, converting the input kana information into kanji information in the server, and sending conversion candidates to the client one at a time. Thus, Shibuya fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "server" providing:

a kana-to-kanji conversion ~~step for, when~~ comprising:

receiving, from a client, kana information ~~of~~ comprising an input character string for which an operating character code has been designated,

converting the kana information into a kanji character string of an intermediate code and a kanji character string of the operating character code, ~~and thereafter~~

**creating a candidate list of a kanji character string ~~consisting of~~ comprising character images of the operating character code and the intermediate code, and**

**sending the candidate list together with a candidate selection program to the client, ~~and causing the client to select a character string of a kanji candidate~~; and**

an editing/outputting ~~step for~~ comprising:

receiving an operating character code of the selected kanji character string from the client; and

transferring the received operating character code to a corresponding operation system.

In other words, Shibuya fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, any server conversion by "receiving, from a client, kana information" and **"sending the candidate list together with a candidate selection program to the client,"** as recited in claims 1, 11 and 12. Shibuya does not send any candidate selection program to the client.

Thus, for example, according to the invention, by, on the client side using a browser, executing a kana-inputting function transferred as a character inputting program, and processing on a server side all functions other than this kana inputting function, i.e., kana-to-kanji conversion functions including word dictionary conversion function, font image conversion

function including custom characters and conversion functions in each code system are processed on the server side so it is not necessary to distribute such data to client terminals. Furthermore, setting up work can be omitted for clients, even for initial introduction since the "candidate selection program" is sent to the client with the "candidate list."

Furthermore, even when the client terminal uses an English-supporting OS having no Japanese-character inputting functions such as Japanese font, a kana-to-kanji dictionary, or the kana-kanji conversion program IME, it is possible to input Japanese characters. Furthermore, the work amount and cost accompanying consolidation can be considerably reduced since an integrated operation system capable of handling concurrent operation systems in different code systems of kana-to-kanji conversion is constructed and existing operation systems in different code systems can be used without making any change to them.

Furthermore, and for the same reasons, Shibuya fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "server," as recited in claims 14-16, providing:

a character conversion ~~step for, when~~ comprising:

receiving from a client a pre-conversion input character string for which an operating character code has been designated,

converting the pre-conversion character string into a post-conversion character string of an intermediate code and a post-conversion character string of the operating character code, ~~and thereafter~~

creating a candidate list of the post-conversion character string consisting of character images of the operating character code and the intermediate code, and

sending the candidate list together with a candidate selection program to the client, and causing the client to select a post-conversion character string; and

an editing/outputting ~~step for~~ comprising:

receiving a selected post-conversion character string from the client, and

transferring the received character string to a corresponding operation system.

#### NEW CLAIMS:

New claim 18 recites:

18. (New) A server in communication with a client comprising:  
a controller,  
receiving, from the client, a kana input character string;

converting the kana input character string into a kanji intermediate code and a kanji operating character code;

creating a candidate list comprising character images of the kanji operating character code and the kanji intermediate code; and

sending the candidate list and a candidate selection program to the client.

New claim 19 recites:

19. (New) A server in communication with a client comprising:  
a controller,

receiving, from a client, the client a pre-conversion input character string;

converting the pre-conversion character string into a post-conversion intermediate code and a post-conversion operating character code;

creating a candidate list comprising character images of the post-conversion operating character code and the post-conversion intermediate code; and

sending the candidate list and a candidate selection program to the client.

Claims 18 and 19 are supported in the specification, for example, on page 23, line 25 to page 25, line 3. Shibuya is directed to an application on a client to submit Romanji information to a sever and to display a single potential kana-to-kanji conversion result submitted from the sever in the client application. However, in contrast, the claims provide "receiving, from a client, a kana input character string" and **"sending the candidate list and a candidate selection program to the client."** Therefore, new claims 18 and 19 are allowable for the same rationale supporting allowability of independent claims 1, 11 and 12 and 14-16, respectively.

**CONCLUSION**


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 30, 2006

By:   
Mehdi Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501